



IFW

**IN THE U.S. PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

Appl. No. : 10/810,924  
Applicant : Kopra, Toni et al  
Filed : March 26, 2004  
TC/AU : 2617  
Examiner : Sams, Matthew C.

Docket No. : 872.0180.U1(US)  
Customer No. : 29683  
Confirmation No.: 9401

Title : FEATURE EXTRACTION IN A NETWORKED PORTABLE DEVICE

Mail Stop Amendment  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**Telephone Interview Summary**

This paper is herewith filed in response to the Telephone Interview Summary mailed on April 06, 2009, for the above-captioned U.S. Patent Application. This paper is deemed to be filed within the shortened statutory period and no petition or fee for an extension of time is required. However, should the undersigned attorney be mistaken, please consider this a petition for any extension of time that may be required to maintain the pendency of this Patent Application, and charge deposit account no.: 50-0510 for any required fee deficiency.

**Telephone Interview Summary**

A telephone interview was conducted between U.S.P.T.O. patent examiner Matthew Sams and Applicant's representative Walter Malinowski on March 31, 2009. Prior to the telephone interview, Applicant's representative had sent a telephone interview agenda in which claims 1, 23, 37, 48, 50, 56, and 57 had been amended.

The patent examiner indicated that claims 37, 56, 57, and 70 likely overcame the prior art of record. He did not think that claims 1, 23, 48, and 50 overcame the prior art of record. He mentioned that he thought there were voice analysis patent publications that probably teach similar subject matter to what has been claimed. Applicant's representative indicated that the claims – at least 37, 56, 57, and 70 – required processing of higher level features and not lower level features. The examiner mentioned that Levy, U.S. Published Patent Application No. 2003/0021441 might be applicable as prior art. The examiner seemed to consider claims 37, 56, 57, and 70 to be stronger than the other independent claims because the higher level feature extraction based on a loop where additional higher level features may be extracted did not seem to be in the prior art and may not be in the voice analysis art he mentioned.

In response to the examiner's comment about "matching" based on only the first and second sets of lower level but not higher level features, the claims were further amended.

Serial No.: 10/810,924  
Our Ref: 872.0180.U1(US)

Interview Summary

Respectfully submitted:



Walter J. Malinowski

Walter J. Malinowski

Reg. No.: 43,423

May 2, 2009

Date

Customer No.: 29683

HARRINGTON & SMITH, PC

4 Research Drive

Shelton, CT 06484-6212

Telephone: (203) 925-9400, extension 19

Facsimile: (203) 944-0245

email: wmalinowski@hspatent.com

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. BOX 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

5/4/2009  
Date

Clair F. Main  
Name of Person Making Deposit